arXiv:1505.04393v2 [math.RA] 23 Nov 2015

STRUCTURE OF UNITAL 3-FIELDS

STEVEN DUPLIJ and WEND WERNER

ABSTRACT. We investigate fields in which addition requires three summands. These ternary fields are shown to be isomorphic to the set of invertible elements in a local ring $\mathcal{R}$ having $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ as a residual field. One of the important technical ingredients is to intrinsically characterize the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{R}$. We include a number illustrative examples and prove that the structure of a finite 3-field is not connected to any binary field.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
1. BASICS AND EXAMPLES 2
2. PAIRS 4
3. IDEALS 7
4. 3-VECTOR SPACES AND UNITAL 3-ALGEBRAS 8
5. FINITE FIELDS 11
REFERENCES 16

INTRODUCTION

Most of us seem to be biologically biased towards thinking that it always requires two in order to generate a third. In mathematics or physics, however, this idea does not seem to rest on a sound foundation: The theory of symmetric spaces, for example, is nicely described in terms of Lie or Jordan triple systems (CHU [2012], UPMEIER [1985]; see e.g. BOHLE AND WERNER [2015] for a recent development), and in physics, higher Lie algebras have come into focus in NAMBU [1973] (for later development see e.g. KERNER [2000], DE AZCARRAGA AND IZQUIERDO [2010]) and were e.g. applied to the theory of M2-branes in BAGGER AND LAMBERT [2008]. Ternary Hopf algebras were introduced and investigated in DUPLIJ [2001].

In this paper we investigate 3-fields, a structure in which the binary operations of the classical theory are replaced by ternary ones. There is a marked difference between addition and multiplication here. Whereas the multiplicative structure of higher arity in rings seems to easier make contact with binary algebra (see e.g. LEESON AND BUTSON [1980] or ELGENDY AND BREMNER [2012]), ternary addition apparently produces phenomena of a more unusual kind and has been, to the knowledge of the authors, treated less thoroughly. We therefore keep multiplication in the fields binary for the moment and stick to ternary addition. Technically, this fact is hidden behind the expression *unital*, as in ternary group theory one can very well dispose of a unit, and, even more strikingly, the truly ternary case is characterized by the absence of one.

Date: May 17, 2015, Version 2: November 19, 2015.

It turns out that there are a number (actually, one that might turn out to be too large) of interesting examples of 3-fields, finite ones, a certain subset of the 2-adic numbers, a class of finite skew-3-fields, based on the quaternion group, or a number of group 3-algebras which actually turn out to be 3-fields.

Here is what we will do in the following: The first section collects some basic theory (based on the pioneering papers by Dörnte and Post DÖRNTE [1929], POST [1940], section 2 introduces the main technical tool that permits a connection to binary algebra, in the third section we deal with ideals which probably feature the most uncommon definition in this paper, section 4 is brief on 3-vector spaces and 3-algebras, just enough in order to be well equipped for a first attack on the classification of finite 3-fields in the final section. Among other things, we will prove here that the number of elements of a finite 3-field is a power of two, that their structure is governed by certain polynomials, with coefficients from the unit disk $\mathcal{B}_2$ of the 2-adic number field $\mathbb{Q}_2$ and (in the case of a single generator, mapping $\partial\mathcal{B}_2$ into the interior of $\mathcal{B}_2$. Furthermore, each such field carries a structure totally different from classical fields, because essentially none of the finite ternary unital 3-fields embeds into a binary field, when the latter is supposed to carry its canonical ternary structure.

1. BASICS AND EXAMPLES

The present topic has some precursors. Besides the ones mentioned in the previous section, so called multioperator linear operations in a vector space were considered in abstract form in the 60's by KUROSH [1969]. Our construction is connected with the notion of (n,m)-rings introduced in ČUPONA [1965] and further studied in CELAKOSKI [1977], CROMBEZ AND TIMM [1972]. The Post theorem for (n,m)-rings was formulated in CROMBEZ [1973].

First we remind the general notion of a $(3,3)$-ring CROMBEZ [1973], CELAKOSKI [1977]. We have two different operations on a set X: the ternary addition $\nu : X\times X\times X \to X$ and the ternary multiplication $\mu : X\times X\times X \to X$. We suppose that both operations are totally associative

$$\nu\left(\nu\left(x,y,z\right),t,u\right)=\nu\left(x,\nu\left(y,z,t\right),u\right)=\nu\left(x,y,\nu\left(z,t,u\right)\right), \tag{1.1}$$

$$\mu\left(\mu\left(x,y,z\right),t,u\right)=\mu\left(x,\mu\left(y,z,t\right),u\right)=\mu\left(x,y,\mu\left(z,t,u\right)\right), \tag{1.2}$$

where $x,y,z,t,u\in X$. This means that both $\langle X,\nu\rangle$ and $\langle X,\mu\rangle$ are ternary semigroups. The connection between them is given by a ternary analog of the distributive law. A general form of the ternary distributivity is

$$\mu\left(\nu\left(x,y,z\right),t,u\right)=\nu\left(\mu\left(x,t,u\right),\mu\left(y,t,u\right),\mu\left(z,t,u\right)\right), \tag{1.3}$$

$$\mu\left(t,\nu\left(x,y,z\right),u\right)=\nu\left(\mu\left(t,x,u\right),\mu\left(t,y,u\right),\mu\left(t,z,u\right)\right), \tag{1.4}$$

$$\mu\left(t,u,\nu\left(x,y,z\right)\right)=\nu\left(\mu\left(t,u,x\right),\mu\left(t,u,y\right),\mu\left(t,u,z\right)\right). \tag{1.5}$$

The semigroup $\langle X,\nu\rangle$ is assumed to be a ternary group in which for all $a,b,c\in X$ there exists a unique solution of the equation DÖRNTE [1929], POST [1940]

$$\nu\left(a,b,x\right)=c. \tag{1.6}$$

Definition 1.1. A set X with two operations ν and μ satisfying distributivity and for which $\langle X,\nu\rangle$ is a (commutative) ternary group and $\langle X,\mu\rangle$ is a ternary semigroup is called a $(3,3)$-*ring*, or for shortness, a 3-*ring*.

Definition 1.2. If ternary multiplication μ on $\mathcal{R}$ is commutative, i.e. if $\mu=\mu\circ\sigma$, where σ is any permutation from S_3, then we call $\mathcal{R}$ a *commutative* 3-*ring*.

A neutral element for $\langle \mathcal{R}, \nu \rangle$, also called a *ternary zero* 0, is defined through

$$\nu(0, 0, x) = x, \tag{1.7}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{R}$.

If such an element exists, $\mathcal{R}$ is called a 3-*ring with zero*. Distributivity then leads to the following relation with respect to ring multiplication

$$\mu(0, x, y) = \mu(x, 0, y) = \mu(x, y, 0) = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Another important notion is the one of a *querelement* DÖRNTE [1929], denoted by $\tilde{x}$ for the addition ν and by $\bar{x}$ for the multiplication μ. They are supposed to satisfy

$$\nu(x, x, \tilde{x}) = x, \tag{1.9}$$

$$\mu(x, x, \bar{x}) = x., \tag{1.10}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{R}$

The existence of querelements for all $x \in \mathcal{R}$ is equivalent to unique solvability (1.6).

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a $(3, 3)$-ring. $\mathcal{R}$ is called a $(2, 3)$-*ring*, if its addition ν is derived from a binary addition $+$, i.e. $\nu(x, y, z) = x + y + z$. Similarly, it is called a $(3, 2)$-*ring*, if its multiplication μ is derived from a binary multiplication $\cdot$, i.e. $\mu(x, y, z) = x \cdot y \cdot z$.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is a $(3, 3)$-ring.*

(1) *If $\mathcal{R}$ contains a multiplicative unit 1, then μ is derived, and $\mathcal{R}$ is a $(3, 2)$-ring.*
(2) *If $\mathcal{R}$ contains a zero element 0, then ν is derived, and $\mathcal{R}$ is a $(2, 3)$-ring.*
(3) *Whenever $\mathcal{R}$ has both, 1 and 0, then it is a binary ring.*

Proof. Define in the first case $a \bullet b = \mu(a, 1, b)$, and $a + b = \nu(a, 0, b)$ in the second case, and check that all axioms are fulfilled in both cases. $\square$

Definition 1.5. We call $\mathcal{R}$ a *proper* $(3, 3)$-*ring*, iff none of μ or ν are derived, and $\mathcal{R}$ is a *proper unital* 3-*ring*, iff its multiplication μ is derived.

In LEESON AND BUTSON [1980], a 3-field was defined as a commutative 3-ring $\mathcal{R}$ for which $\langle \mathcal{R}^*, \mu \rangle$ is a group.

Definition 1.6. A unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ is called *proper*, iff μ is nonderived, i.e. iff there is no zero element in $\mathbb{F}$.

In the following, all 3-fields will be proper and unital.

Example **1.7**. When equipped with ternary addition and multiplication inherited from the complex number field, the set $i\mathbb{R}$ becomes a $(2, 3)$-field.

Example **1.8**. For a class of proper $(3, 3)$-fields, start with a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$. Fix a unital 3-subfield $\mathbb{F}_1$ as well as an element $t \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \mathbb{F}_1$ so that $t^2 \in \mathbb{F}_1$. Then $t\mathbb{F}_1$ is a proper $(3, 3)$-field.

Example **1.9**. A finite unital 3-field is given by

$$(\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z})^{\text{odd}} = \{2k + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z} \mid 0 \leq 2k + 1 \leq 2^n\}. \tag{1.11}$$

The fact that each element has a multiplicative inverse follows from the fact that $\gcd(a, 2^n) = 1$, for all $a \in (\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z})^{\text{odd}}$.

Recall that a cancellative and commutative 3-ring $\mathcal{R}$ is called a 3-integral domain CROMBEZ AND TIMM [1972].

Example **1.10** (3-field of fractions CROMBEZ AND TIMM [1972]). For any proper 3-integral domain the 3-field of fractions is a proper 3-field. For instance, starting with

$$\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}} = \{2k+1 \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

we arrive at the proper 3-field

$$\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}} = \left\{ r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}, r = \frac{p}{q} \right\}. \tag{1.12}$$

Trying to find a completion of $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$ which itself is a proper 3-field one has to avoid a zero element in the process. The easiest way to do this seems to be to exploit the relationship of $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$ with the field of dyadic numbers, $\mathbb{Q}_2$. Recall the definition of the absolute value $|\cdot|_2$. If $\dfrac{p}{q} = 2^r \dfrac{p_0}{q_0}$, where neither of the integers p_0 and q_0 is divisible by 2, we have

$$\left| \frac{p}{q} \right|_2 = 2^{-r}. \tag{1.13}$$

Completion of $\mathbb{Q}$ w.r.t. $|\cdot|_2$ results in the field $\mathbb{Q}_2$, the elements of which can be formally written as

$$x = \sum_{r \geq -n_0} \varepsilon_r 2^r, \quad \varepsilon_r \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.14}$$

and $|x|_2 = 2^{n_0}$. Then $|x|_2 = 1$, iff

$$x = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_r 2^r, \quad \varepsilon_r \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.15}$$

Example **1.11**. The set $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\mathrm{odd}} = \mathbb{Z}_2^{\times} = \{x \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \mid |x|_2 = 1\}$ is a unital 3-field w.r.t multiplication and ternary addition inherited from $\mathbb{Q}_2$. This field is the completion of $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$ w.r.t. $|\cdot|_2$. Note that this 3-field is compact. Furthermore, similar to the binary case, $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\mathrm{odd}}$ is an inverse limit $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\mathrm{odd}} = \varprojlim (\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z})^{\mathrm{odd}}$.

2. PAIRS

Let us introduce one of the most important constructions of this paper, an additive *operator pair* of a unital 3-ring $\mathcal{R}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a unital 3-ring, and for $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$ denote by $\mathbf{q}_{a,b}$ the additive operator pair $x \to x + a + b$ for all $x \in \mathcal{R}$. Write $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}) = \{\mathbf{q}_{a,b} \mid a, b \in \mathcal{R}\}$, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{R}$.

Note that the above definition yields an equivalence relation on the Cartesian product $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{R}$. This kind of construction has been used in POST [1940] in order to “reduce arity”: For any fixed $c \in \mathcal{R}$ we can use operator pairs to introduce the binary *retract addition* $\oplus_c$ by

$$a \oplus_c b = \mathbf{q}_{a,b}(c). \tag{2.1}$$

Since the choice of c is arbitrary, this construction is not functorial, and we will follow a different path here.

First, we convert the set of pairs into a (binary) ring. In order to reduce the technical effort to a minimum we use pairs in their *standard forms*: For each pair we have

$$\mathbf{q}_{a,b} = \mathbf{q}_{a+b-1,1},$$

and whenever $\mathbf{q}_{s,1} = \mathbf{q}_{t,1}$ then $s = t$. With this notation we (well-)define *binary addition* $+_q$ and the *binary product* $\times_q$ for pairs in the following way

$$\mathbf{q}_{\alpha,1} +_q \mathbf{q}_{\beta,1} = \mathbf{q}_{\alpha+\beta+1,1}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\mathbf{q}_{\alpha,1} \times_q \mathbf{q}_{\beta,1} = \mathbf{q}_{\alpha+\beta+\alpha\beta,1}. \tag{2.3}$$

We extend these operations to $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$. For $u, v \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$ let

$$u +_{\mathcal{U}} v = \begin{cases} q_{u,v}, \quad u, v \in \mathcal{R}, \\ u(v) = a + b + v, \quad u = \mathbf{q}_{a,b} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}), v \in \mathcal{R}, \\ u +_q v, \quad u, v \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}), \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

$$u \times_{\mathcal{U}} v = \begin{cases} uv, \quad u, v \in \mathcal{R}, \\ \mathbf{q}_{av,bv}, \quad u \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}), v \in \mathcal{R}, \\ u \times_q v, \quad u, v \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}), \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

These operations are well-defined and we furthermore have

Theorem 2.2. *$\langle \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}), +_q, \times_q \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}), +_u, \times_u \rangle$ are binary rings, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$ is unital of which $\mathcal{R}$ is a subring, whereas $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R})$ is an ideal.*

For the proof it is very convenient to use pairs in their standard forms. We leave the details to the reader.

Example **2.3**. Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}^{\text{odd}}$. Then $\varphi : \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}) \to \mathbb{Z}^{\text{even}}$, $\mathbf{q}_{a,b} \xmapsto{\varphi} a + b$, is a well-defined isomorphism of binary (nonunital) rings, and $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$ equals $\mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, for the unital 3-field $\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}$ we have

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}\right) = \mathbb{Q}^{\text{even}} = \left\{ r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}^{\text{even}}, q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\text{odd}}, r = \frac{p}{q} \right\}, \tag{2.6}$$

as well as

$$\mathcal{U}\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}\right) = \mathbb{Q}^{\text{even}} \cup \mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}} = \left\{ r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\text{odd}}, r = \frac{p}{q} \right\}. \tag{2.7}$$

In the same vein,

$$\mathcal{Q}\left(\left(\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z}\right)^{\text{odd}} \right) = \left(\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z}\right)^{\text{even}}, \quad \mathcal{U}\left(\left(\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z}\right)^{\text{odd}} \right) = \left(\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z}\right). \tag{2.8}$$

Denote by $\mathfrak{F}_3$ the category of unital 3-fields. For each morphism $\phi : \mathbb{F}^{(1)} \to \mathbb{F}^{(2)}$ define mappings $\mathcal{Q}\phi : \mathcal{Q}\mathbb{F}^{(1)} \to \mathcal{Q}\mathbb{F}^{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{U}\phi : \mathcal{U}\mathbb{F}^{(1)} \to \mathcal{U}\mathbb{F}^{(2)}$, by

$$\mathcal{Q}\phi\left(\mathbf{q}_{a,b}\right) = \mathbf{q}_{\phi(a),\phi(b)}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\mathcal{U}\phi(u) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{Q}\phi(u), \quad u \in \mathcal{Q}\mathbb{F}^{(1)}, \\ \phi(u), \quad u \in \mathbb{F}^{(1)}. \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

It is easily seen that $\mathcal{Q}\phi$ and $\mathcal{U}\phi$ are (unital) morphisms. It follows that $\mathcal{U}$ is a functor between the category $\mathfrak{F}_3$ and the category of binary unital rings $\mathfrak{R}_2$.

In the following, we write i_F for the embedding $\mathbb{F} \to \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$.

Theorem 2.4. *A unital 3-ring $\mathcal{R}$ carries a derived structure iff it is a retract of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{R}$ is a binary unital ring, the retract mapping is given by $\Psi(\mathbf{q}_{a,b}) = a + b$ on $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R})$ and the identity otherwise. Conversely, if such a map exists, we define a binary product on $\mathcal{R}$ through $a + b = \Psi(\mathbf{q}_{a,b})$. □

A direct consequence of this is

Theorem 2.5 (Universal functor theorem)**.** *The functor $\mathcal{U}$ is universal in the following sense. Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is a unital binary ring, $\mathbb{F}$ is a unital 3-field, and $\varphi : \mathbb{F}\to\mathcal{R}$ is a morphism of unital 3-rings, where $\mathcal{R}$ is supposed to carry the derived ternary structure. Then, there exists a morphism $\bar{\varphi} : \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}) \to\mathcal{R}$ of binary rings, such that $\bar{\varphi} \circ i_F = \varphi$.*

We investigate next, how unital 3-fields can be analyzed in terms of binary algebraic structures.

Theorem 2.6 (3-fields and local rings)**.**

1. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a (unital) local binary ring with (unique) maximal ideal $\mathcal{J}$ so that $\mathcal{R}\diagup\mathcal{J} \cong\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$ is a unital 3-field.*
2. *For any unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$, there exists a local binary ring $\mathcal{R}$ with residual field $\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathbb{F}\cong\mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$, where $\mathcal{J}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$ carries the derived ternary structure inherited from $\mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. (1) Let $\pi_{\mathcal{J}} : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}\diagup\mathcal{J}$ be the quotient map. Suppose $a_{1,2,3} \in \mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$. Since $a \in \mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$, iff $\pi_{\mathcal{J}}(a)$ is in $\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$, it follows that $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \in \mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$. It is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$ is an additive 3-group. Similarly, the product $a_1 a_2 \in \mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$, and distributivity is satisfied. It remains to show that each $a \in \mathcal{R}\setminus\mathcal{J}$ has a multiplicative inverse. Suppose a has no inverse, by Krull's theorem it is contained in a maximal ideal different from $\mathcal{J}$, thus contradicting the locality of $\mathcal{R}$.

(2) Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a unital 3-field. By Theorem **2.2** $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$ is a binary unital ring. We show that $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ is a unique maximal ideal with $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})\diagup\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$. Evidently, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$. As all elements in $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})\setminus\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ are invertible, this ideal has to be maximal. By the same reason, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ is the only maximal ideal. So $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$ is a local ring.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})\diagup\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$. Take $r \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$. If $r \in \mathbb{F}$, then $r + \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}) = 1 + \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$, because $r + \bar{r} + 1 = 1$, and therefore $r \sim 1$. If $r \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$, then, of course, $r + \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}) = 0 + \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$, i.e. $r \sim 0$. So there are only two equivalence classes and hence $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})\diagup\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$. □

Remark **2.7**. It is not difficult to see that the functor $\mathcal{U}$ actually establishes an equivalence of the categories of unital local rings with residual field $\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$ and the category of unital 3-fields.

Example **2.8**. In the case of $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\mathrm{odd}}$, its local ring is the valuation ring $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{Q}_2) = \{z \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \mid |z|_2 \leq 1\}$ with (maximal) evaluation ideal $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Q}_2) = \{z \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \mid |z|_2 < 1\}$, and $\mathbb{Q}_2^{\mathrm{odd}} = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{Q}_2)\setminus\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Q}_2)$.

Here is another application:

Theorem 2.9. *For any unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ the following are equivalent.*

1. *There exists an embedding of $\mathbb{F}$ into a binary field $\mathbb{K}$, where the latter is supposed to carry its derived ternary structure.*
2. *$\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ is an integral domain.*
3. *For each $y \neq 1$ the equation*
$$x + y - xy = 1 \tag{2.11}$$
has the only solution $x = 1$.

Proof. It is easily checked that conditions (2) and (3) are equivalent. Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ is an integral domain, and denote by $\mathbb{K}$ its field of quotients. Then

$$\Psi : \mathbb{F} \to \mathbb{K}, \qquad \Psi(x) = \frac{q_{x,x}}{q_{1,1}} \tag{2.12}$$

is an embedding, and so (a) follows. Conversely, whenever there exists an embedding $\mathbb{F} \to \mathbb{K}$, $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$ is injectively mapped into $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F})$, which is an integral domain. $\square$

3. IDEALS

Because of the absence of zero in a proper 3-ring, the usual correspondence between ideals and kernels of morphisms is no longer available. Instead, we apply the results of the previous section.

Let us consider a morphism of unital 3-rings $\phi : \mathcal{R}_1 \to \mathcal{R}_2$. Then $\ker \mathcal{U}(\phi)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}_1)$, and the underlying equivalence relation on $\mathcal{R}_1$ is given by

$$r_1 \sim r_2 \Longleftrightarrow \exists \mathbf{q} \in \ker \mathcal{U}(\phi) : r_1 + \mathbf{q} = r_1. \tag{3.1}$$

Note that $\ker \mathcal{U}(\phi)$ is contained in $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R}_1)$, and so $\mathbf{q}$ must be an additive pair. The above is a motivation for

Definition 3.1. An *ideal* for a unital 3-ring $\mathcal{R}$ is any (binary) ideal of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R})$. We furthermore denote the quotient an ideal of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{R})$ defines on $\mathcal{R}$ by $\mathcal{R} / \mathcal{J}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are unital 3-rings, and $\phi : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{S}$ is a morphism. Then the quotient $\mathcal{R} / \ker \mathcal{U}(\phi)$ is a unital 3-ring, and $\mathcal{R} / \ker \mathcal{U}(\phi) \simeq \operatorname{Im} \phi$.*

Remark **3.3**. We prefer the expression “an ideal *for* a unital 3-ring” over “an ideal *of*...”, as the former is not a subset of $\mathcal{R}$.

The following theorem is an analogue to the fact that for a binary ring the quotient by an ideal is a field, iff the ideal is maximal.

Theorem 3.4. *For a unital 3-ring $\mathcal{R}$ and an ideal $\mathcal{I}$, the quotient $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{I}$ is a unital 3-field, iff for any proper ideal $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$ for which $\mathcal{J} \supseteq \mathcal{I}$ it follows that $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{R} = \varnothing$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbb{F} = \mathcal{R}/\mathcal{I}$ is a unital 3-field but $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{R} \neq \varnothing$ for some proper ideal $\mathcal{J}$ containing $\mathcal{I}$. Let $\pi : \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}) \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}) / \mathcal{I}$ be the quotient map. It then follows that $\pi(\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{R}) = \mathbb{K}$, hence $\pi(\mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{K})$, and so $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$.

If, on the other hand, for any proper ideal $\mathcal{J} \supseteq \mathcal{I}$ we have $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{R} = \varnothing$, we choose $r \in \mathcal{R}/\mathcal{I}$ as well as $r_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ with $\pi(r_0) = r$. If r were not invertible, then the ideal $\mathcal{J}_0$ generated by r_0 and $\mathcal{I}$ would be proper, contain $\mathcal{I}$ and intersect $\mathcal{R}$. $\square$

Example **3.5**. Consider the $(3,2)$-ring $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}} = \{2k+1 \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Note that each proper ideal in the non-unital ring $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{even}}$ is principal, i.e. they are of the form $(2k_0) = \{2k_0 k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now we claim that $(2k_0)$ satisfies (**3.4**), iff $k_0 = 2^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $p \mid k_0$ and $p \neq 2$. Then $(2p) \supseteq \mathcal{I}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}$, and so $\mathcal{I}$ cannot satisfy (**3.4**).

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a unital 3-field, then each ideal in $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$ is “evenly maximal”, and so for each $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$, $\mathbb{F}/\mathcal{J}$ again is a field. This is quite different from the binary case.

Example **3.6**. The proper ideals for $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}} = \left\{ r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}, r = \dfrac{p}{q} \right\}$ are of the form

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \left\{ r \in \mathcal{U}\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}\right) \mid \exists q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}, \exists u \in \mathbb{Z}, r = 2^n \frac{u}{q} \right\} = \langle 2^n \rangle, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.2}$$

Obviously, all the $\mathcal{J}_n$ are ideals for $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$. Conversely, let $\mathcal{J}$ be an ideal, and

$$n_0 = \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}, 2^n \frac{p}{q} \in \mathcal{J} \right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Because any $r \in \mathcal{J}$ is of the form $2^n \dfrac{u}{q}$, $u \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}$, $n \geq n_0$ we must have $\mathcal{J}_{n_0} \supseteq \mathcal{J}$. Fix an element $2^{n_0} \dfrac{p_0}{q_0} \in \mathcal{J}$, $p_0, q_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}$. Then $2^{n_0} \dfrac{u}{q} \in \mathcal{J}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{odd}}$ and hence $\mathcal{J} \supseteq \mathcal{J}_{n_0}$.

We apply this observation to prime fields. Let us consider a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ with unit 1 and define $\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}}$ to be the 3-subfield generated by 1, i.e. $\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}} = \langle 1 \rangle$.

Definition 3.7. The *characteristic* of a unital 3-field is $\chi(\mathbb{F}) = \left|\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}}\right|$.

Theorem 3.8. *If $\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}}$ is finite, then there is $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ so that $\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z})^{\mathrm{odd}}$. Otherwise, $\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}} \cong \mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$.*

Proof. Define a morphism $\psi : \mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}} \to \mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{prim}}$ by $\psi(p/q) = pq^{-1}$ which is well-defined and surjective (since $\mathrm{im}\psi$ is a 3-subfield containing 1), and so we must prove that $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}/\mathcal{J}_n = \mathbb{Z}_{2^n}^{\mathrm{odd}}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since the case $\ker\psi = \{0\}$ is trivial, we suppose $n > 1$. Then division with reminder by 2^n yields a morphism $Z^{\mathrm{odd}} \to \mathbb{Z}_{2^n}^{\mathrm{odd}}$, which extends to the quotient 3-field $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$. It is easily checked that the kernel of this extension is the ideal $\mathcal{J}_n$. □

4. 3-VECTOR SPACES AND UNITAL 3-ALGEBRAS

Let us define a ternary analogue of the concept of a vector space.

Definition 4.1. A 3-*vector space* consists of a commutative 3-group of vectors, V, a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ as well as an action of $\mathbb{F}$ on V. Furthermore, $1v = v$ for all $v \in V$, and the (ternary analog of) usual distributivity relations are supposed to hold. Linear mappings between 3-vector spaces are defined in the obvious way.

It is easily seen that for any 3-vector space V over $\mathbb{F}$ we have a canonical action of $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$ on $\mathcal{U}(V)$.

Definition 4.2. A subset $E \subseteq V$ of a 3-vector space over a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ is called a *generating system*, iff any element of V can be represented as $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i a_i$ with $\lambda_i \in U(\mathbb{F})$, $a_i \in E$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F}$. A is called a *basis*, iff this representation is unique. If A is any subset of V we denote by $\mathrm{lin}\, A$ the 3-vector subspace of V generated by A.

Remark 4.3. It is important to observe that any linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i$ with $\lambda_i \in U(\mathbb{F})$, $v_i \in V$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F}$ yields an element of V.

Example 4.4. A 3-vector space V over the unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ is given by

$$(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\mathrm{free}} = \left\{ (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}) \mid \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \in \mathbb{F} \right\}. \tag{4.1}$$

It has a basis consisting of elements $e_i = (\delta_{ij})_j \in (\mathbb{F}^n)^{\mathrm{free}}$. Note that $\mathbb{F}^n$ is a 3-vector space as well, which however does not possess a basis if n is different from 1. If $n = 1$, $\mathbb{F}^{\mathrm{free}} = \mathbb{F}$, and any element of $\mathbb{F}$ is a basis.

Proposition 4.5. *Every 3-vector space over a unital 3-field has a free resolution V^{free}.*

Proof. We pick a generating set $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$, and let $V^{\mathrm{free}} = \{(f_1, \ldots, f_n) \mid \sum f_i \in \mathbb{F}\}$. Define $\phi_V : V^{\mathrm{free}} \to V$ by $(f_1, \ldots, f_n) \longmapsto \sum_{i=1}^n f_i e_i$. Then $\ker\phi_V$ is a $U(\mathbb{F})$-submodule contained in $\mathcal{Q}\left(V^{\mathrm{free}}\right)$. Hence V is isomorphic to $V^{\mathrm{free}}/\ker\phi_V$. □

Corollary 4.6. *The number of elements of a 3-vector space over the finite 3-field F, generated by n elements is*

$$\frac{|\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})|^n}{2\,|\ker\phi_V|} = 2^{n-1}\frac{|\mathbb{F}|^n}{|\ker\phi_V|} \tag{4.2}$$

For the proof, note that $|\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})| = 2\,|\mathbb{F}|$, using, e.g. the standard form of pairs.

Example **4.7**. Consider $\mathbb{F}^2 = \{1,3\}^2 = \left\{\binom{a}{b} \mid a,b,\in (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^{\text{odd}}\right\}$ over $\mathbb{F} = (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^{\text{odd}} = \{1,3\}$. We have $V = \left\{\begin{pmatrix}1\\1\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}3\\1\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}1\\3\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}3\\3\end{pmatrix}\right\}$. A generating set is $\left\{\begin{pmatrix}1\\1\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}3\\1\end{pmatrix}\right\} = \{e_1, e_2\}$. Thus, a free resolution is given by $V^{\text{free}} = \left\{ae_1 + be_2 \mid a,b \in \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z},\ a+b \in (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^{\text{odd}}\right\}$.

Definition 4.8. Let A be a 3-vector space over the unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$. We call A a *unital (commutative)* 3-*algebra*, iff there exists a binary multiplication $(\bullet)$ on A so that $(A,+,\bullet)$ is a (commutative) unital 3-ring.

In the following, 3-algebras will be mostly commutative.

Example **4.9**. Let G be a binary group and $\mathbb{F}$ a unital 3-field. The group algebra of G over $\mathbb{F}$ is defined by

$$\mathbb{F}G = \left\{\phi : G \to \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}) \mid \sum_{g\in G}\phi(g) \in \mathbb{F}\right\} \tag{4.3}$$

together with the convolution product $(\phi * \psi)(g) = \sum_{g_1 g_2 = g}\phi(g_1)\,\psi(g_2)$. It can be shown that $\phi * \psi \in \mathbb{F}G$. These 3-algebras quite often seem to be 3-fields. For example, in the case where G equals the additive group $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, we have $\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}(n)$, as defined below.

Example **4.10**. We define the *Toeplitz field* of order n over $\mathbb{F}$, $\mathbb{T}(n,\mathbb{F})$, as the set of all matrices

$$t = \begin{pmatrix} f & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ b_1 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{n-1} & \cdots & b_1 & f \end{pmatrix},\quad f \in \mathbb{F},\ \ b_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}),\ \ i = 1,\ldots,n-1. \tag{4.4}$$

Note that the inverse of each t is of the same form, and hence the Toeplitz fields are commutative 3-subfields of the triangular 3-fields from Example **5.16**. The number of elements in this field is

$$|\mathbb{T}(n,\mathbb{F})| = |\mathbb{F}|\,|\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})|^{n-1} = 2^{n-1}\,|\mathbb{F}|\,. \tag{4.5}$$

Actually, these 3-fields are isomorphic to the members of the next class of examples.

Example **4.11**. Fix a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ as well as a natural number n, and define

$$\mathbb{F}(n) = \left\{P = f + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i\,(x-1)^i \mid a_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}),\ f \in \mathbb{F},\ (x-1)^n = 0\right\}. \tag{4.6}$$

it is easily checked that this is a unital 3-algebra, generated by the single polynomial $x-1$. That each element in this 3-algebra has an inverse is a consequence of the isomorphism established below.

In fact, that $\mathbb{F}(n) \cong \mathbb{T}(n,\mathbb{F})$ can be seen as follows. The 3-vector space $\mathbb{F}(n)$ has basis

$$E = \left\{ e_i = (x-1)^i \mid i = 0,\dots,n-1 \right\}, \tag{4.7}$$

and if we consider an element $P = f + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b_i (x-1)^i \in \mathbb{T}_+(n,\mathbb{F})$, $f \in \mathbb{F}$, $b_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$, $i = 1,\dots,n-1$ as a linear map on $\mathbb{F}(n)$, then its matrix representation w.r.t. E is given by

$$t_f = \begin{pmatrix} f & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ b_1 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{n-1} & \cdots & b_1 & f \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.8}$$

Since the product of $\mathbb{F}(n)$ turns out to be the matrix product of these matrices, the claim has been proven.

Definition 4.12. Fix a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ and let

$$\mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n] = \\ = \left\{ \sum_{|\alpha|\le N} f_\alpha x^\alpha \mid \alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n), \quad N \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad f_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}), \quad \sum f_\alpha \in \mathbb{F} \right\}. \tag{4.9}$$

We call this space the *polynomial algebra in n variables over the 3-field $\mathbb{F}$*. Note that this space actually is a unital 3-algebra when we use the usual product of polynomials.

Note that

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n]) =: \mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n]^{\text{even}} \\ = \left\{ \sum_{|\alpha|\le N} f_\alpha x^\alpha \mid \alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n), \; N \in \mathbb{N}_0, \; f_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}), \; \sum f_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}) \right\}. \tag{4.10}$$

and $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n]) = \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})[x_1,\dots,x_n]$.

Theorem 4.13 (Universality of polynomial algebras)**.** *The polynomial algebra $\mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ is universal in the class of unital 3-algebras over $\mathbb{F}$, generated by n elements.*

The polynomial algebra $\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ is universal in the class of all unital 3-algebras over any of the prime fields, generated by n elements.

The proof closely follows the standard line of reasoning: If A is an algebra generated by $a_1,\dots,a_n$, define $\Psi : \mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n] \to A$ by $\Psi\left(\sum_{|\alpha|\le N} f_\alpha x_1^{\alpha_1},\dots,x_n^{\alpha_n}\right) = \sum_{|\alpha|\le N} f_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1},\dots,a_n^{\alpha_n}$ and use section 2 to see that $A \cong \mathbb{F}[x_1,\dots,x_n] / \ker\Psi$.

The statement about $\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ follows by applying the first part of this theorem for the respective prime field and then by combining the quotient mapping with the one from Example **3.6**.

5. FINITE FIELDS

In this final section we collect some results and examples concerning finite unital 3-fields. We will mainly be concerned with the case $\chi(\mathbb{F}) = 1$ and put $\mathbb{F}_0 = \{1\}$. As a general idea, the theory looks quite different from the classical (binary) one. One of the major differences lies in the fact that the minimal number of generators may be strictly larger than one.

Our first result still looks familiar, though.

Theorem 5.1 (Cardinality of finite fields)**.** *For each finite unital* 3*-field the number of elements is a power of* 2*.*

Proof. Clearly, each finite unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ is a 3-vector space over $\operatorname{Prim}\mathbb{F}$. By Corollary **4.6**, the number of elements in $\mathbb{F}$ is $2^{n-1}\dfrac{|\operatorname{Prim}\mathbb{F}|^n}{|\ker\phi_{\mathbb{F}}|} = 2^{n-1}\dfrac{\chi(\mathbb{F})^n}{|\ker\phi_{\mathbb{F}}|}$. According to Theorem **3.8**, $\chi(\mathbb{F})$ is a power of 2, which $|\ker\phi_{\mathbb{F}}|$ must divide, and the result follows. ☐

For any polynomial $P = \sum_\nu a_\nu x^\nu$ in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ we let $\|P\|_2 = \max_\nu |a_\nu|_2$. Then $\|P\|_2 \le 1$ iff $P \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}})[x]$, and $\|P\|_2 = 1$ iff, moreover, P has at least one coefficient in $\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}$. Then, for any $P, Q \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$, we have $\|PQ\|_2 = \|P\|_2\|Q\|_2$. This follows from he fact that the product of two polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, having both at least one odd coefficient, possesses itself at least one odd coefficient.

Lemma 5.2. *The irreducible polynomials for the ring $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}})[x]$ are: the constant polynomial 2 and those polynomials P which are irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$, and for which $\|P\|_2 = 1$.*

Definition 5.3. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be any prime field. We call a polynomial P with coefficients from in $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$ *completely even* iff

1. P is even, and,
2. up to units, P does not admit a factorization in which one of the factors is odd.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose $\mathbb{F}$ is a prime field and that P_0 is any polynomial in $\mathbb{F}[x]^{\text{even}}$. Then $\mathbb{F}[x]/\langle P_0\rangle$ is a unital 3-field iff P_0 is completely even.*

Proof. Clearly, whenever P_0 has a factorization $P_0 = QP$, with Q a non-invertible odd polynomial, $\langle Q\rangle$ is an ideal larger than $\langle P_0\rangle$, strictly smaller than $\mathbb{F}[x]^{\text{even}}$, and intersecting $\mathbb{F}[x]^{\text{odd}}$. For the converse, suppose P_0 is completely even. For the purpose of this proof, we will also assume that P_0 does not contain any invertible odd factor. We first look at the case in which $|\mathbb{F}| = \infty$. For an ideal $\mathfrak{I} \in \mathcal{U}[x]$ we write $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ for the ideal $\mathfrak{I}$ generates in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$, i.e.

$$\mathfrak{I}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \left\{2^{-n}P \mid P \in \mathfrak{I},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}. \tag{5.1}$$

Since $(\mathcal{U}[x]P_0)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the principal ideal generated by P_0 in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$, we find for any Ideal $\mathfrak{I}$ of (and different from) $\mathcal{U}[x]$, larger than $\mathcal{U}[x]P_0$, a factorization $P_0 = PQ$ so that $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q}[x]P$. Since for no $n \in \mathbb{N}$, 2^{-n} is a factor of P_0, we actually may suppose that $P, Q \in U[x]$ and still have $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q}[x]P$. It follows that P and Q are even and so

$$\mathfrak{I} \cap \mathcal{U}[x]^{\text{odd}} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}[x]P \cap \mathcal{U}[x]^{\text{odd}} = \emptyset \tag{5.2}$$

Now suppose $|\mathbb{F}| = 2^n$ and denote by

$$\pi_n : \mathbb{Q}^{\text{odd}}[x] \to (\mathbb{Z}/2^n\mathbb{Z})^{\text{odd}}[x] \tag{5.3}$$

the canonical quotient map, reducing the coefficients of elements in $Q^{\text{odd}}[x]$ to coefficients in $(Z/2^nZ)^{\text{odd}}$. We again will suppose that P_0 does not contain any invertible odd factor. Fix a polynomial $P_1 \in \mathcal{U}[x]^{\text{even}}$, of the same degree as P_0, such that $\pi_n(P_1) = P_0$. Then

P_1 has to be completely even as well, and so by the first part, $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}[x]\diagup\langle P_1\rangle$ is a unital 3-field.

The result then follows from the fact that for $|\mathbb{F}|=2^n$

$$\mathbb{F}[x]\diagup\langle P_1\rangle=\pi_n\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}[x]\diagup\langle P_0\rangle\right). \tag{5.4}$$

□

Example **5.5**. The polynomial $P=x^n-1$ is completely even, iff n is a power of 2. In fact, if $n=2^k n_0$, with $n_0>1$ and odd, then

$$x^n-1=(x-1)\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n_0}x^{n_0-m}\right)\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(x^{2^{k-j}n_0}+1\right), \tag{5.5}$$

where $\sum_{m=1}^{n_0}x^{n_0-m}$ is odd.

Corollary 5.6. *Each finite, singly generated unital 3-field* $\mathbb{F}$ *is the quotient of a singly generated unital 3-field* $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}$ *with prime field* $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}$.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose* $\mathbb{F}$ *is a finite unital* 3*-field with* $\chi(\mathbb{F})=1$*, and denote by* $\mathbb{F}_0=\{1\}$ *its prime field. If* $\mathbb{F}$ *is generated by a single element, then it is isomorphic to*

$$\mathbb{F}_0[x]\diagup\left\langle(x-1)^n\right\rangle\cong\mathbb{F}_0(n) \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. By the above result, and since $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}_0)=\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z}$ is a (binary) field, there must be a completely even polynomial $P\in(\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z})[x]$ so that $\mathbb{F}=\mathbb{F}_0[x]\diagup\langle P\rangle$. Writing a polynomial $Q\in\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{odd}}[x]$ in powers of $(x-1)$ we have that Q is even iff its constant term is even, and it is odd iff its constant term is. Now, a polynomial P for which there are $n_0<\ldots<n_k$ with

$$P=(x-1)^{n_0}+\ldots+(x-1)^{n_k}=(x-1)^{n_0}(1+\ldots+(x-1)^{n_k-n_0}), \tag{5.7}$$

clearly is not completely even, and we are done.

Finally, $\mathbb{F}_0[x]\diagup\left\langle(x-1)^n\right\rangle\cong\mathbb{F}_0(n)$ follows from the fact that $\Phi:\mathbb{F}_0[x]\longrightarrow\mathbb{F}_0$,

$$\Phi(Q)=\left(Q(1),\ldots,\frac{Q^{(\nu)}(1)}{\nu!},\ldots,\frac{Q^{(n-1)}(1)}{(n-1)!}\right)\mod 2 \tag{5.8}$$

is an epimorphism with kernel $\langle(x-1)^n\rangle$. □

We look into some further examples and, especially, determine their automorphism groups. To this end we will use

Lemma 5.8. *There is a 1-1 correspondence between the automorphisms of* $\mathbb{F}_0(n)$ *and polynomials* $P=\sum_j f_j x^j$*,* $f_j\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}_0(n))$*,* $\sum f_j\in\mathbb{F}_0$*, for which there exists another such polynomial* Q *with* $P\circ Q=x$.

Example **5.9**. Let us start with a classical field extension. For $\chi(\mathbb{F})=1$ we formally adjoin a square root of 3 and obtain $\mathbb{F}\left[\sqrt{3}\right]$. More explicitly,

$$\mathbb{F}\left[\sqrt{3}\right]=\left\{a+b\sqrt{3}\mid a,b\in\mathbb{Z}\diagup 2\mathbb{Z},a+b=1\right\}, \tag{5.9}$$

and it turns out that this 3-field is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}(2)$. Note that this field has a trivial automorphism group.

Example **5.10**. Let us have a look at $\mathbb{F}\,(3)$, where $\mathbb{F}$ is as before. We use polynomials in the generator x and denote the elements $a = x$, $b = x^2$, $c = x^2 + x + 1$, $a, b, c, 1 \in \mathbb{F}\,(3)$. The multiplicative Cayley table is

$\cdot$	1	a	b	c
1	1	a	b	c
a	a	b	c	1
b	b	c	1	a
c	c	1	a	c

(5.10)

To find nontrivial automorphisms on $\mathbb{F}\,(3)$ we construct the Cayley table under compositions as

$\circ$	a	b	c
a	a	b	c
b	b	1	b
c	c	b	a= x

(5.11)

We observe that one nontrivial automorphism on $\mathbb{F}\,(3)$ is connected to c, because $c \circ c = a = x$. So the group of automorphisms is $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, or, for later use, the dihedral group of order 2, respectively.

Example **5.11**. Let us denote elements of $\mathbb{F}\,(4)$ as

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
x	x^2	x^3	$x^2 + x + 1$	$x^3 + x + 1$	$x^3 + x^2 + 1$	$x^3 + x^2 + x$

(5.12)

The multiplicative Cayley table for $\mathbb{F}\,(4)$ is

$\cdot$	1	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
1	1	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
a	a	b	c	1	g	d	e	f
b	b	c	1	a	f	g	d	e
c	c	1	a	b	e	f	g	d
d	d	g	f	e	b	a	1	c
e	e	d	g	f	a	1	c	b
f	f	e	d	g	1	c	b	a
g	g	f	e	d	c	b	a	1

(5.13)

To find nontrivial automorphisms we make use of the Cayley table w.r.t. composition, and we find that the (nontrivial) automorphisms are exactly those given by the polynomials c, d, f. Composition is then given by the following table,

$\circ$	a	c	d	f
a	a= x	c	d	f
c	c	a= x	f	d
d	d	f	a= x	c
f	f	d	c	a= x

(5.14)

which upon inspection yields that the automorphism group equals the dihedral group of order 4.

Example **5.12**. Let us denote elements of $\mathbb{F}(5)$ as

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
x	x^2	x^3	x^4	x^2+x+1	x^3+x+1	x^4+x+1

p	q	r	s
x^3+x^2+1	x^4+x^2+1	x^4+x^3+1	x^3+x^2+x

t	u	v	w
x^4+x^2+x	x^4+x^3+x	$x^4+x^3+x^2$	$x^4+x^3+x^2+x+1$

(5.15)

Then similar calculations give us the nontrivial automorphisms induced by the polynomials c, e, g, p, r, t, v. Together with the identity morphism $a = x$ they obey the following Cayley table under composition

$\circ$	a	c	e	g	p	r	t	v
a	a$=x$	c	e	g	p	r	t	v
c	c	a$=x$	p	r	e	g	v	t
e	e	v	g	t	c	p	a$=x$	r
g	g	r	t	a$=x$	v	c	e	p
p	p	t	r	v	a$=x$	e	c	g
r	r	g	v	c	t	a$=x$	p	e
t	t	p	a$=x$	e	r	v	g	c
v	v	e	c	p	g	t	r	a$=x$

(5.16)

This is the dihedral group of order 8.

Note that all these automorphism groups would be the "Galois" groups for the respective extensions of $\{1\}$. Also, $\mathbb{F}(n)$ is a quotient of $\mathbb{F}(m)$ whenever $n < m$.

Theorem 5.13. *A finite unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$ admits an embedding into a binary field $\mathbb{K}$ iff $\mathbb{F} = \{1\}$.*

Proof. If $\chi(\mathbb{F}) > 1$, then $Q(\operatorname{Prim}\mathbb{F})$ is not an integral domain, and so $\operatorname{Prim}\mathbb{F}$ (and much less $\mathbb{F}$) can be embedded into a binary field. In case $\chi(\mathbb{F}) = 1$, the statement follows since $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{F}_0(n))$ in this case is not an integral domain, either. □

We conclude with some remarks on finite unital 3-fields in characteristic 1. We begin with two examples

Fix a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$, and put

$$\mathbb{F}_0(n_1,\dots,n_k) = \mathbb{F}_0[x_1,\dots,x_k] \diagup \left\langle (x_1-1)^{n_1},\dots,(x_k-1)^{n_k}\right\rangle \tag{5.17}$$

This extension of $\mathbb{F}$ is characterized by the fact that it displays the fewest possible relations a field of k generators possibly can have (this will be made precise below). It can be shown that

$$\mathbb{F}_0(n_1,\dots,n_k) = \left\{ 1 + \sum_{(1,\dots,1)\le\alpha\le(n_1-1,\dots,n_k-1)} \varepsilon_\alpha(1-x)^\alpha \mid \varepsilon_\alpha = 0,1,\ (x_k-1)^{n_k} = 0,\ k = 1,\dots,n \right\}, \tag{5.18}$$

where $(1-x)^\alpha = (1-x_1)^{\alpha_1}\cdots(1-x_n)^{\alpha_n}$. Much more relations are necessary in order to present the Cartesian product $\mathbb{F}_0(n_1)\times\ldots\times\mathbb{F}_0(n_k)$. Denote by ξ_i the generator of the 3-field $\mathbb{F}_0(n_i)$ and by x_i the element of $\mathbb{F}_0(n_1)\times\ldots\times\mathbb{F}_0(n_k)$ which has the unit element in each entry except at the place i where it is ξ_i. Then for each element $(f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathbb{F}_0\,(n_1) \times \ldots \times \mathbb{F}_0\,(n_k)$ there are $\varepsilon_{ij} = 0, 1$ so that

$$(f_1, \dots, f_n) = (1, \dots, 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \varepsilon_{ij} (1 - x_i)^j. \tag{5.19}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{F}_0\,(n_1) \times \ldots \times \mathbb{F}_0\,(n_k) = \\ &\mathbb{F}_0\,[x_1, \dots, x_k] \diagup \langle (x_1 - 1)^{n_1}, \dots, (x_k - 1)^{n_k}, (x_i - 1)(x_j - 1), i, j = 1, \dots, n, i \neq j \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Theorem 5.14. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field with $\chi(\mathbb{F}) = 1$, generated as a unital 3-field by n elements. Let, as before, $\mathbb{F}_0 = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{\mathrm{odd}} = \{1\}$.*

1. *There exist natural numbers $k_1, \dots, k_n$ such that $\mathbb{F}$ is a quotient of $\mathbb{F}_0(k_1, \dots, k_n)$.*
2. *The ideal $\mathcal{J}$ such that $\mathbb{F} \cong \mathbb{F}_0\,[x_1, \dots, x_n] \diagup \mathcal{J}$ is of the form*

$$\mathcal{J} = \left\langle (x_1 - 1)^{k_1}, \dots, (x_n - 1)^{k_n}, P_1, \dots, P_N \right\rangle, \tag{5.21}$$

where the polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_N$ are neither divisible by an odd polynomial nor by any of the $(x_k - 1)^{n_k}$.

Proof. Denote by $x_1, \dots, x_n$ the 3-field generators of $\mathbb{F}$. As each of them generates a unital 3-field, $(x_i - 1)^{k_i} = 0$ for some k_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and it follows that there is a quotient map of $\mathbb{F}_0(k_1, \dots, k_n)$ onto $\mathbb{F}$.

In order to prove the second part of the theorem, we select even polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_N$, not divisible by any of the $(x_k - 1)^{n_k}$, so that $\mathbb{F} \cong \mathbb{F}_0(k_1, \dots, k_n) \diagup \langle P_1, \dots, P_N \rangle$. Similar to the proof of Theorem **5.7**, one can show that it is not possible that any of these polynomials contains an odd factor (Alternatively, one can use the fact that all odd polynomials which can arise as factors here are invertible.) □

Example **5.15**. Let us consider the "unfree" unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}^2$ and the "free" unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}\,(n_1, n_2)$. We show that $\mathbb{F}\,(2) \times \mathbb{F}\,(2)$ and $\mathbb{F}\,(2, 2)$ are not isomorphic. By definition, we have $\mathbb{F}\,(2) = \{1 + \varepsilon\,(y - 1) \mid \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z} \diagup 2\mathbb{Z}\}$, which contains 2 elements $\{1, y\}$ with the relations (as pairs) $1 + 1 = y + y = 0$ and $1^2 = y^2 = 1$. The most unfree 3-field $\mathbb{F}\,(2) \times \mathbb{F}\,(2)$ has 4 elements and generated by $x_1 = \begin{pmatrix} y \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $x_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ y \end{pmatrix}$. It is easily seen that $x_1^2 = x_2^2 = 1$, $x_1 x_2 = x_1 + x_2 - 1$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{F}\,(2) \times \mathbb{F}\,(2) = \mathbb{Z}_2\,[x_1, x_2]^{\mathrm{odd}} \diagup \left\langle (x_1 - 1)^2, (x_2 - 1)^2, P \right\rangle, \tag{5.22}$$

where the additional polynomial is $P = (x_1 - 1)\,(x_2 - 1)$ (see (5.21)). On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{F}\,(2, 2) = \{1 + \varepsilon_1\,(x_1 - 1) + \varepsilon_2\,(x_2 - 1) + \varepsilon\,(x_1 - 1)\,(x_2 - 1) \mid \varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2\} \tag{5.23}$$

contains 8 elements and

$$\mathbb{F}\,(2, 2) = \mathbb{Z} \diagup 2\mathbb{Z}\,[x_1, x_2]^{\mathrm{odd}} \diagup \left\langle (x_1 - 1)^2, (x_2 - 1)^2 \right\rangle, \tag{5.24}$$

which is not isomorphic to the field in (5.22).

Our final examples show that there are finite unital 3-fields which are noncommutative.

Example **5.16** (Triangular 3-fields). Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a unital 3-field an put

$$\mathbb{D}\left(n,\mathbb{F}\right)=\left\{A_n\left(f_i,b_{ij}\right)\mid f_i\in\mathbb{F},b_{ij}\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathbb{F}\right),i.j=1,\ldots,n\right\}, \tag{5.25}$$

where

$$A_n\left(f_i,b_{ij}\right)=\begin{pmatrix} f_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ b_{ij} & & f_n \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.26}$$

It is easily seen that, $\mathbb{D}\left(n,\mathbb{F}\right)$ is a noncommutative unital 3-algebra (if $n>1$). Note that each $A_n\left(f_i,b_{ij}\right)$ is invertible, and that its inverse has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_1^{-1} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ \hat{b}_{ij} & & f_n^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.27}$$

where $\hat{b}_{ij}\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathbb{F}\right)$. (Observe that the standard procedure for the inversion of a matrix yields expressions which are well-defined within $\mathbb{F}$.) So it follows that $\mathbb{D}\left(n,\mathbb{F}\right)$ actually is a noncommutative unital 3-field, which is finite in case $\mathbb{F}$ is.

Example **5.17** (Quaternion 3-fields). We start by selecting a unital 3-field $\mathbb{F}$, let

$$\mathbb{HF}=\left(\mathbb{F}^4\right)^{\text{free}}=\left\{\sum_{\mu=0}^{3}a_\mu i_\mu\mid a_\mu\in\mathcal{U}\left(\mathbb{F}\right),\sum_{\mu=0}^{3}a_\mu\in\mathbb{F}\right\}, \tag{5.28}$$

where i_μ, $\mu=0,1,2,3$, denotes a set of basis elements. We suppose that the quaternion relations $i_1^2=i_2^2=i_3^2=i_1i_2i_3=-1,i_0=1$ hold and extend this multiplication to the whole of $\mathbb{HF}$. This product is well-defined, since the sum of the coefficients $c_k\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$ in $\sum_{k=0}^{3}a_ki_k\sum_{k=0}^{3}b_ki_k=\sum_{k=0}^{3}c_ki_k$, $a_k,b_k\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F})$, $\sum_{k=0}^{3}a_k\in\mathbb{F},\sum_{k=0}^{3}b_k\in\mathbb{F}$ can be written in the form

$$\sum_{k=0}^{3}c_k=\sum_{k=0}^{3}a_k\sum_{k=0}^{3}b_k-2\left(\sum_{k=0}^{3}\gamma_k\right),\quad\gamma_k\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{F}), \tag{5.29}$$

which clearly is an element of $\mathbb{F}$. So $\mathbb{HF}$ is a unital 3-algebra. In addition, if $q=a_0+a_1i_1+a_2i_2+a_3i_3$, we let $\bar{q}=a_0-a_1i_1-a_2i_2-a_3i_3$ and observe that $q\bar{q}=(a_0^2+a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2)i_0\in\mathbb{HF}$. Then, for each element q of $\mathbb{HF}$, an inverse is given by

$$q^{-1}=\frac{\bar{q}}{q\bar{q}}=\frac{a_0-a_1i_1-a_2i_2-a_3i_3}{a_0^2+a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2}\in\mathbb{HF} \tag{5.30}$$

and thus, $\mathbb{HF}$ is a non-commutative 3-field.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. Research supported by the ERC through AdG 267079.

The first named author (S.D.) would like to express his gratitude to Joachim Cuntz and Raimar Wulkenhaar for their kind hospitality and financial support.

REFERENCES

BAGGER, J. AND N. LAMBERT [2008]. Gauge symmetry and supersymmetry of multiple M2-branes. *Phys. Rev.* **D77**, 065008.

BOHLE, D. AND W. WERNER [2015]. A K-theoretic approach to the classification of symmetric spaces. *J. Pure and App. Algebra* **219** (10), 4295–4321.

CELAKOSKI, N. [1977]. On (F,G)-rings. *God. Zb., Mat. Fak. Univ. Kiril Metodij Skopje* **28**, 5–15.

CHU, C.-H. [2012]. *Jordan structures in geometry and analysis*, Volume 190 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CROMBEZ, G. [1973]. The Post coset theorem for (n, m)-rings. *Ist. Veneto Sci. Lett. Arti, Atti, Cl. Sci. Mat. Natur.* **131**, 1–7.

CROMBEZ, G. AND J. TIMM [1972]. On (n, m)-quotient rings. *Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hamb.* **37**, 200–203.

ČUPONA, G. [1965]. On $[m, n]$-rings. *Bull. Soc. Math. Phys. Macedoine* **16**, 5–9.

DE AZCARRAGA, J. A. AND J. M. IZQUIERDO [2010]. n-Ary algebras: A review with applications. *J. Phys.* **A43**, 293001.

DÖRNTE, W. [1929]. Unterschungen über einen verallgemeinerten Gruppenbegriff. *Math. Z.* **29**, 1–19.

DUPLIJ, S. [2001]. Ternary Hopf algebras. In: A. G. NIKITIN AND V. M. BOYKO (Eds.), *Symmetry in Nonlinear Mathematical Physics*, Kiev: Institute of Mathematics, pp. 25–34.

ELGENDY, H. A. AND M. R. BREMNER [2012]. Universal associative envelopes of $(n+1)$-dimensional n-Lie algebras. *Comm. Algebra* **40** (5), 1827–1842.

KERNER, R. [2000]. Ternary algebraic structures and their applications in physics, *preprint* Univ. P. & M. Curie, Paris, 15 p.

KUROSH, A. G. [1969]. Multioperator rings and algebras. *Russian Math. Surveys* **24**, 1–13.

LEESON, J. J. AND A. T. BUTSON [1980]. On the general theory of (m, n) rings. *Algebra Univers.* **11**, 42–76.

NAMBU, Y. [1973]. Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics. *Phys. Rev.* **7**, 2405–2412.

POST, E. L. [1940]. Polyadic groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **48**, 208–350.

UPMEIER, H. [1985]. *Symmetric Banach manifolds and Jordan C^*-algebras*, Volume 104 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, WESTFÄLISCHE WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER, EINSTEINSTRASSE 62, 48149 MÜNSTER, GERMANY